UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,767	10/06/2003	Douglas Albagli	125649	8307

7590 07/11/2005

General Electric Company
CRD Patent Docket Rm 4A59
P.O. Box 8, Bldg. K-1
Schenectady, NY 12301

EXAMINER	
POLYZOS, FAYE S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2878	

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/681,767	**Applicant(s)** ALBAGLI ET AL.	
	Examiner Faye Polyzos	**Art Unit** 2878	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 October 2003*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-58* is/are pending in the application.
  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-31,38-41,48-51 and 58* is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) *32-37,42-47 and 52-57* is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *08 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/03, 4/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-2, 8-10, 14-15, 19-21, 29-31, 38-41 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Mollov et al (WO 03/071307 A1).*

Regarding claim 1, Mollov discloses of a solid-state radiation imager (300), comprising: a substantially radiation transparent substrate (350) having a first surface and a second surface from the first surface, wherein the first surface is adapted to receive incident radiation; a scintilllator material (320) having a first surface (322) and a second surface (324) opposite from the first surface; and a pixilated array (340) of photosensitive elements disposed between the substantially radiation transparent substrate and the scintillator material, wherein the pixilated array of photosensitive elements is disposed between the first surface of the scintillator (322) and the second surface of the substantially radiation transparent substrate (See Generally Fig. 3 and [0037],[0041]-[0043] and [0048]).

Regarding claim 2, Mollov discloses the radiation transparent substrate comprises a glass material ([0048]).

Regarding claim 8, Mollov discloses the substantially radiation transparent substrate has a transmission that is greater than about 80 percent (low absorption)([0037]-[0038]).

Regarding claim 9, Mollov discloses the substantially radiation transparent substrate has a transmission that ranges from about 85 percent to about 95 percent (low absorption)([0037]-[0038]).

Regarding claim 10, Mollov discloses the substantially radiation transparent substrate has a thickness that ranges from about 100 microns to about 5000 microns ([0049]).

Regarding claim 14, Mollov discloses an x-ray imager comprising: a substantially radiation transparent substrate (350) having a first surface and a second surface from the first surface, wherein the first surface is adapted to receive incident radiation; a scintilllator material (320) having a first surface (322) and a second surface (324) opposite from the first surface wherein the scintillator material is adapted to absorb the incident x-rays received by the substantially radiation transparent substrate and generate light; and a pixilated array (340) of photosensitive elements disposed between the substantially radiation transparent substrate and the scintillator material, wherein the pixilated array of photosensitive elements is disposed between the first surface of the scintillator (322) and the second surface of the substrate, and wherein the pixilated array of photosensitive elements is adapted to determine the amount of x-ray energy received by each pixel in the array (See Generally Fig. 3 and [0030]-[0033], [0037], [0041]-[0043] and [0048]).

Regarding claim 15, Mollov discloses the radiation transparent substrate comprises a glass material ([0048]).

Regarding claim 19, Mollov discloses the substantially radiation transparent substrate has a transmission that is greater than about 80 percent (low absorption) ([0037]-[0038]).

Regarding claim 20, Mollov discloses the substantially radiation transparent substrate has a transmission that ranges from about 85 percent to about 95 percent (low absorption) ([0037]-[0038]).

Regarding claim 21, Mollov discloses the substantially radiation transparent substrate has a thickness that ranges from about 100 microns to about 5000 microns ([0049]).

Regarding claim 29, Mollov discloses of a solid-state radiation imager (300), comprising: a substantially radiation transparent substrate (350) having a first surface and a second surface from the first surface, wherein the first surface is adapted to receive incident radiation; a scintilllator material (320) having a first surface (322) and a second surface (324) opposite from the first surface; and a pixilated array (340) of photosensitive elements disposed between the substantially radiation transparent substrate and the scintillator material, wherein the first surface of the pixilated array of photosensitive elements is disposed on the second surface of the substrate; and a substantially transparent material (330) disposed between the pixilated array of photosensitive elements and the scintillator material (320), wherein the substantially transparent material is disposed between the first surface of the scintillator and the second surface of the pixilated array of photosensitive elements (See Generally Fig. 3 and [0037],[0041]-[0043] and [0048]).

Regarding claims 30-31, Mollov discloses the substantially transparent material comprises a silicon-based dielectric of silicon oxide ([0054]-[0055]).

Regarding claim 38, Mollov discloses the substantially transparent material has an atomic number that is less than or equal to 14 ([0048]).

Regarding claim 39, Mollov discloses an x-ray imager comprising: a substantially radiation transparent substrate (350) having a first surface and a second surface from the first surface, wherein the first surface is adapted to receive incident radiation; a scintilllator material (320) having a first surface (322) and a second surface (324) opposite from the first surface wherein the scintillator material is adapted to absorb the incident x-rays received by the substrate and generate light; and a pixilated array (340) of photosensitive elements disposed between the substantially radiation transparent substrate and the scintillator material, wherein the pixilated array of photosensitive elements is disposed between the first surface of the scintillator (322) and the second surface of the substrate, and wherein the pixilated array of photosensitive elements is adapted to determine the amount of x-ray energy received by each pixel in the array; and a substantially transparent material disposed between the pixelated array of photosensitive elements and the scintillator material, wherein the substantially transparent material is disposed between the first surface of the scintillator material and the second surface of the pixelated array of photosensitive elements from electrons generated in the scintillator material (See Generally Fig. 3 and [0030]-[0033],[0037], [0041]-[0043], [0048]).

Regarding claims 40-41, Mollov discloses the substantially transparent material comprises a silicon-based dielectric of silicon oxide ([0054]-[0055]).

Regarding claim 48, Mollov discloses the substantially transparent material has an atomic number that is less than or equal to 14 ([0048]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mollov et al (WO 03/071307 A1)* as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of *Zhong et al (US 6,060,714 A).*

Regarding claim 3, Mollov discloses the substantially radiation transparent substrate comprises of glass material [0037] and [0048]. Mollov does not specifically disclose of the glass material comprises quartz. Zhong discloses the glass material comprises quartz (col. 3, lines 11-13). Zhong teaches an x-ray imager includes in each pixel substantially transparent substrate such as; glass, quartz, plastic, or the like (col. 3, lines 11-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggested by Mollov, to include quartz as suggested supra by Zhong, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

5. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mollov et al (WO 03/071307 A1)* as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of *Hoelsher et al (US 5,083,031 A).*

Regarding claim 4, Mollov discloses of the substantially radiation transparent substrate comprises a glass material ([0048]). Mollov does not specifically disclose of the thickness range of the glass material. Hoelsher discloses the glass material has a thickness that ranges from about 200 microns to about 700 microns (col. 8, lines 58-61). Hoelsher teaches thin glass substrates can be used to achieve accurate and reliable dosimeter measurements even though glass is considered a non-tissue-equivalent material (col. 9, lines 3-6). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggested by Mollov to include a substantially radiation transparent substrate in the range of thickness, as disclosed supra by Hoelsher, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

Regarding claim 5, Hoelsher discloses the substantially radiation transparent substrate comprises a polymer material (col. 8, lines 3-5).

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mollov et al (WO 03/071307 A1) and Hoelsher et al (US 5,083,031 A) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Theiss et al ("PolySilicon Thin Film Transistors Fabricated at 100 Degrees C on a Flexible Plastic Substrate").

Regarding claim 6, Hoelsher discloses of a radiation transparent substrate comprising a polymer material (col. 8, lines 3-5). Neither Mollov nor Hoelsher disclose wherein the polymer comprises at least one of polyethylene terepthalate, polymide, polyether sulfone, polycarbonate and polyetherimide. Theiss discloses wherein the substrate comprises a polymer material of polyethylene terephthalate (pp. 257). Theiss teaches because of high optical quality, low cost, and compatibility with most semiconductor processing chemicals, polyethylene terephthalate (PET) would seem to be an ideal candidate for a substrate material (pp. 257). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggest by Mollov and Hoelsher to incorporate a substrate comprising a polymer material made of polyethylene terephthalate, as suggested supra by Theiss, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mollov et al (WO 03/071307 A1)* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Polischuk et al (US 6,171,643 B1).*

Regarding claim 7, Mollov disclose the substrate comprising of a glass material ([0037] and [0048]). Mollov does not disclose of the substrate comprising aluminum oxide. Polischuk discloses the transparent substrate comprises aluminum oxide (col. 4, lines 31-40). Polischuk teaches aluminum has been widely used because of it high oxidation potential and its ability to form a high-quality uniform aluminum oxide layer to prevent electron injection from the substrate into the bulk of selenium (col. 4, lines 31-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggested by Mollov and Hoelsher to include a substrate of aluminum oxide, as suggested supra by Polischuk, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

8. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mollov et al (WO 03/071307 A1)* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of DeJule *et al (US 6,541,774 B1).*

Regarding claim 11, Mollov discloses of a protective layer disposed near an outer side of the imager ([0033]-[0035]). Mollov does not disclose the protective cover is disposed on the scintillator. DeJule discloses the protective layer (140) disposed on the second surface of the scintillator material (130) (See Generally Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 11-18). DeJule teaches the protective layer is disposed over the scintillator to protect the scintillator from exposure to ambient conditions, such as moisture and air (col. 2, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggested by Mollov to dispose a protective layer on the second surface of the scintillator, as disclosed supra by DeJule, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

9. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeJule *et al (US 6,541,774 B1)* as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of *Zur (US 6,784,433 B2).*

Regarding claims 12-13, DeJule discloses of a protective cover disposed on the scintillator (See Generally Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 11-18). DeJule does not disclose the material of the protective cover. *Zur* discloses the protective cover comprises of a radiation opaque material of tungsten (col. 8, lines 15-23). *Zur* teaches x-ray absorbent materials such as lead or tungsten are typically used for x-ray shielding (col. 8, lines 15-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggested by

DeJule to include a protective material comprising opaque material, as disclosed supra by Zur, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mollov et al (WO 03/071307 A1)* as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of *Hoelsher et al (US 5,083,031 A)*.

Regarding claim 16, Mollov discloses of the substantially radiation transparent substrate comprises a glass material ([0048]). Mollov does not specifically disclose of the thickness range of the glass material. Hoelsher discloses the glass material has a thickness that ranges from about 200 microns to about 700 microns (col. 8, lines 58-61). Hoelsher teaches thin glass substrates can be used to achieve accurate and reliable dosimeter measurements even though glass is considered a non-tissue-equivalent material (col. 9, lines 3-6). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggested by Mollov to include a substantially radiation transparent substrate in the range of thickness, as disclosed supra by Hoelsher, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

11. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mollov et al (WO 03/071307 A1)* as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of *Theiss et al ("PolySilicon Thin Film Transistors Fabricated at 100 Degrees C on a Flexible Plastic Substrate")*.

Regarding claim 17, Mollov discloses the radiation transparent substrate comprises a glass material ([0048]). Mollov does not disclose wherein the polymer comprises at least one of polyethylene terepthalate, polymide, polyether sulfone,.

polycarbonate and polyetherimide. Theiss discloses wherein the substrate comprises a polymer material of polyethylene terephthalate (pp. 257). Theiss teaches because of high optical quality, low cost, and compatibility with most semiconductor processing chemicals, polyethylene terephthalate (PET) would seem to be an ideal candidate for a substrate material (pp. 257). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggest by Mollov and Hoelsher to incorporate a substrate comprising a polymer material made of polyethylene terephthalate, as suggested supra by Theiss, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

12. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mollov et al (WO 03/071307 A1)* as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of *Polischuk et al (US 6,171,643 B1).*

Regarding claim 18, Mollov and disclose the substrate comprising of a glass material ([0048]). Mollov does not disclose of the substrate comprising aluminum oxide. Polischuk discloses the transparent substrate comprises aluminum oxide (col. 4, lines 31-40). Polischuk teaches aluminum has been widely used because of it high oxidation potential and its ability to form a high-quality uniform aluminum oxide layer to prevent electron injection from the substrate into the bulk of selenium (col. 4, lines 31-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggested by Mollov and Hoelsher to include a substrate of aluminum oxide, as suggested supra by Polischuk, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

13. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mollov et al (WO 03/071307 A1)* as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of DeJule *et al (US 6,541,774 B1).*

Regarding claim 22, Mollov discloses of a protective layer disposed near an outer side of the imager ([0033]-[0035]). Mollov does not disclose the protective cover disposed on the scintillator. DeJule discloses the protective layer (140) disposed on the second surface of the scintillator material (130) (See Generally Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 11-18). DeJule teaches the protective layer is disposed over the scintillator to protect the scintillator from exposure to ambient conditions, such as moisture and air (col. 2, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggested by Mollov and Hoelsher to dispose a protective layer on the second surface of the scintillator, as disclosed supra by DeJule, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

14. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeJule *et al (US 6,541,774 B1)* as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of *Zur (US 6,784,433 B2).*

Regarding claim 23, DeJule discloses of a protective cover disposed on the scintillator (See Generally Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 11-18). DeJule does not disclose the material of the protective cover. *Zur* discloses the protective cover comprises of a radiation opaque material of tungsten (col. 8, lines 15-23). *Zur* teaches x-ray absorbent materials such as lead or tungsten are typically used for x-ray shielding (col. 8, lines 15-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggested by

DeJule to include a protective material comprising opaque material, as disclosed supra by Zur, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

15. Claims 24-28, 49-51 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mollov et al (WO 03/071307 A1) and* DeJule *et al (US 6,541,774 B1).*

Regarding claim 24, Mollov discloses of a solid-state radiation imager (300), comprising: a substantially radiation transparent substrate (350) having a first surface and a second surface from the first surface, wherein the first surface is adapted to receive incident radiation; a scintilllator material (320) having a first surface (322) and a second surface (324) opposite from the first surface; and a pixilated array (340) of photosensitive elements disposed between the substantially radiation transparent substrate and the scintillator material, wherein the pixilated array of photosensitive elements is disposed between the first surface of the scintillator (322) and the second surface of the substrate (See Generally Fig. 3 and [0037],[0041]-[0043] and [0048]). Mollov does not specifically disclose of a protective cover being disposed on the second surface of the scintillator material. DeJule discloses the protective layer (140) disposed on the second surface of the scintillator material (130) (See Generally Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 11-18). DeJule teaches the protective layer is disposed over the scintillator to protect the scintillator from exposure to ambient conditions, such as moisture and air (col. 2, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggested by Mollov to comprise a protective layer disposed on the second surface of the scintillator, as disclosed supra by DeJule, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

Regarding claim 25, Mollov discloses the radiation transparent substrate comprises a glass material ([0048]).

Regarding claim 26, Mollov discloses the substantially radiation transparent substrate has a transmission that is greater than about 80 percent (low absorption) ([0037]-[0038]).

Regarding claim 27, Mollov discloses the substantially radiation transparent substrate has a transmission that ranges from about 85 percent to about 95 percent (low absorption) ([0037]-[0038]).

Regarding claim 28, Mollov discloses the substantially radiation transparent substrate has a thickness that ranges from about 100 microns to about 5000 microns ([0049]).

Regarding claim 49, Mollov discloses of a solid-state radiation imager (300), comprising: a substantially radiation transparent substrate (350) having a first surface and a second surface from the first surface, wherein the first surface is adapted to receive incident radiation; a scintilllator material (320) having a first surface (322) and a second surface (324) opposite from the first surface; and a pixilated array (340) of photosensitive elements disposed between the substantially radiation transparent substrate and the scintillator material, wherein the pixilated array of photosensitive elements is disposed between the first surface of the scintillator (322) and the second surface of the substrate; and a substantially transparent material disposed between the pixelated array of photosensitive elements and the scintillator material, wherein the substantially transparent material is disposed between the first surface of the scintillator material and the second surface of the pixelated array of photosensitive elements (See Generally Fig. 3 and [0030]-[0033], [0041]-[0043]). Mollov does not specifically disclose of a protective cover being disposed on the second surface of the scintillator material. DeJule discloses the protective layer (140) disposed on the second surface of the scintillator material (130) (See Generally Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 11-18). DeJule teaches the protective layer is disposed over the scintillator to protect the scintillator from exposure to ambient conditions, such as moisture and air (col. 2, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus suggested by Mollov to dispose a protective layer on the second surface of the scintillator, as disclosed supra by DeJule, to allow for a more versatile apparatus.

Regarding claims 50-51, Mollov discloses the substantially transparent material comprises a silicon-based dielectric of silicon oxide ([0054]-[0055]).

Regarding claim 58, Mollov discloses the substantially transparent material has an atomic number that is less than or equal to 14 ([0048]).

Allowable Subject Matter

16. Claims 32-37, 42-47, 52-57 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

17. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding dependent claims 32, 42 and 52, the prior art, as stated supra, does not disclose or fairly suggest of solid-state radiation imager wherein the silicon-based dielectric has a thickness that ranges from about 1 micron to about 5 microns.

Regarding dependent claims 33, 43 and 53, the prior art, as stated supra, does not disclose or fairly suggest of solid-state radiation imager wherein the silicon-based dielectric has a thickness that ranges from about 2 micron to about 12 microns.

Regarding dependent claims 34-35, 44-45 and 54-55, the prior art, as stated supra, does not disclose or fairly suggest of solid-state radiation imager wherein the substantially transparent material comprises a polymer material.

Regarding dependent claims 36, 46 and 56, the prior art, as stated supra, does not disclose or fairly suggest of solid-state radiation imager wherein the polymer material has a thickness that ranges from about 1.5 microns to about 8 microns.

Regarding dependent claims 37, 47 and 57, the prior art, as stated supra, does not disclose or fairly suggest of solid-state radiation imager wherein the polymer material has a thickness that ranges from about 3 microns to about 20 microns.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faye Polyzos whose telephone number is 571-272-2447. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Porta can be reached on 571-272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FP

DAVID PORTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800